UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,697	12/30/2003	Wolfgang Kalthoff	13907-061001 / 2003P00407	2888

32864 7590 02/12/2007		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		BELL, CORY C
		ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER
		2164

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/747,697	KALTHOFF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cory C. Bell	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/20/2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. All of applicants arguments submitted on 12/30/2003 have been fully considered.

    2.1. The objection to the abstract has been withdrawn after further consideration.

    2.2. The rejection under 35 USC 101 stands, as applicants arguments are not persuasive as
    applicants amendment includes a phrase that lacks proper antecedent support in the
    . specification.

    2.3. With regards to the applicants traversal of the rejection under 35 USC 102 for claim 1,
    the applicants arguments are incorrect. The applicant submits "In Rauen, by contrast, a
    single routine is called to handle data errors." First, the cited portion relates to the
    detection of AIC errors; however the system also have modules for handling BizTalk™
    and local error (see paras 580 and 582.) Second the called subroutine is itself made up
    of several modules to handle the different types of appropriate error handling (see para
    583). Last, it is noted the specification does not include support for modules at all,
    instead it dispatches errors to different people which is show in paras 588-591.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the
following is required: The specification lacks antecedent bases for "tangible machine readable
medium" and "modules."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as they fail to provide a tangible result, as the applicant defines a machine-readable medium to includes non-tangible mediums in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The applicants specification provides not support for "error correction modules," instead the applicant provides support for error corrections, which are people. It is noted that the industry accepted meaning of module, as defined in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th edition, is "In programming, a collection of routines and data structures that performs a particular task or implement a particular abstract idea."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by US 2004/0015408, known

hereafter as Rauen..

6.1. *As per independent claims 1 and 9*, Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

receiving data inputted in a data entry format by a user through a user interface; transforming the

data from the data entry format to a first data storage format; {Para 388. Para 708}

identifying an error in the data; {Para 570}

   routing the data to a selected one of first and second error correction modules, the first

   and second error correction modules being configured to correct first and second types of data

   errors, respectively, the first and second types of data errors being different;{Paras 583-589}

      receiving corrected data from the selected one of the first and second error correction

   modules{Para 591};

and storing the corrected data in the first database in the first data storage format. {Para 388. Para

708, figure 25}

7. *As per dependent claims 2 and 10,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

> 2. The method of claim 1, wherein the transformation is performed by a rules-based
>
> procedure. {Para 388 teaches using a mapping which is a rules-based procedure using the
>
> broadest reasonable interpretation}

8. *As per dependent claims 3, 7, 11 and 15,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

> 3. The method of claim 1, further comprising providing default data values in the user
>
> interface to the user. {Paras 733 748 and 749}

9. *As per dependent claims 4 and 12,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

> 4. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving data identifying the user. {Para 140}

10. *As per dependent claims 5 and 13,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

> 5. The method of claim 4, further comprising: deriving additional data to be stored in the first
>
> data storage format based on the inputted data and based on the identity of the user; storing
>
> the additional data in the first database. {Para 586 teaches deriving associations between the
>
> users enterprise id and the entered data}

11. *As per dependent claims 6 and 14,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

> 6. The method of claim 4, further comprising defining dynamically the data entry format
>
> based on the identity of the user. {Para 807 teaches a user profile for storing the language of

the user which intern is used to selected the data entry format}

12. *As per dependent claims 8 and 16,* Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising: transforming the data from the data entry

format to a second data storage format; and storing the data in a second database in the data

storage format. {Figure 30 teaches storing data in a second storage format(another language)

and storing it in a second data base}

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauen in view

of US 5182705, known hereafter as Barr.

13.1.   Claims 17 and 19 are rejected for the following reasons:

13.1.1. Rauen teaches the subject matter of all claims upon which claims 17 and 19 are

dependant, but fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claims 17 and 19.

13.1.2. Barr teaches the limitations of claims 17 and 19 in col 61, the caseload monitoring

function being used to maintain a balanced workload, inherently includes workers

with more work then the average not getting assigned cases, and instead those cases

being shifted to those with a lower workload. The reassignment function also

provides a means for shifting work from one employee to another.

13.1.3. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to include the features of Barr in Rauen, as it provides the advantage

of an organized and automated workflow management system to make work more

efficient.

13.2.   Claims 18 and 20 are rejected for the following reasons:

13.2.1. Rauen teaches the subject matter of all claims upon which claims 18 and 20 are

dependant, but fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claims 118 and 20.

13.2.2. Barr teaches the limitations of claims 18 and 20 in col 61.

13.2.3. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to include the features of Barr in Rauen, as it provides the advantage

of an organized and automated workflow management system to make work more

efficient.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Us 2002/0184308 Teaches how to perform internationalization (I18n) transformations. US2002/0156688 teaches a global commerce system using I18n. Us 6018742 teaches creating multilingual database systems. Us 5442782 teaches a multilingual/I18n database system. Designing Multinational Online Stores teaches I18n of web-based stores. Federated Database Systems for Managing Distributed, Heterogeneous, and Autonomous Databases teaches how to implement a distributed database system, like that implemented in Rauen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER